



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/697,017	10/31/2003	Jonathan Zhanjun Yue	1300.0001	4531
48222	7590	09/12/2007		
KEVIN J. MCNEELY, ESQ. 5335 WISCONSON AVENUE, NW SUITE 440 WASHINGTON, DC 20015			EXAMINER FORD, GRANT M	
			ART UNIT 2141	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 09/12/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

8

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/697,017		YUE, JONATHAN ZHANJUN	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Grant Ford		2141	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 October 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 October 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10-31-2003</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-5,9-11,15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by MacIntosh et al. (6,973,481), hereinafter referred to as MacIntosh.

a. As per claim 1, MacIntosh discloses a method of screening a message, comprising:

conveying a first electronic message from a public address of a receiver to a private address of the receiver (Col 12 line 16 through Col 13 line 13); and

delivering the conveyed first electronic message from the private address to a receiver address (Col 8 lines 23-37, Col 12 line 16 through Col 13 line 13).

b. As per claim 2, MacIntosh discloses assigning the public address and the private address to the receiver (Col 12 line 16 through Col 13 line 13).

c. As per claim 3, MacIntosh discloses terminating the public address after a time period (Col 11 lines 5-30, Col 12 line 55 through Col 13 line 8).

Art Unit: 2141

d. As per claim 4, MacIntosh discloses rejecting a second message sent to the terminated public address (Col 12 lines 17-44).

e. As per claim 5, MacIntosh discloses replacing the terminated public address with a new unique public address (Col 14 line 62 through Col 15 line 11, Col 15 lines 36-57).

f. As per claim 9, MacIntosh discloses registering the receiver having the receiver address and providing a user account to the registered receiver, wherein the user account comprises the private address and the public address (Col 10 lines 5-49).

g. As per claim 10, MacIntosh discloses wherein the providing the user account further comprises requesting entry of a unique user identification and a password and further comprising allowing access to the user account with the user identification and the password (Col 3 line 59 through Col 4 line 11, Col 8 lines 42-59).

h. As per claim 11, MacIntosh discloses determining whether the requested user identification is an email account to be protected; and requesting an email address of the email account to be protected if the requested user identification is not the email account to be protected (Col 3 line 59 through Col 4 line 11, Col 10 lines 7-49).

i. As per claim 15, MacIntosh discloses wherein the first electronic message comprises an email message, the private address comprises a first email address, and the public address comprises a second email address (Col 12 line 16 though Col 13 line 13).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 6-8, 16-17, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MacIntosh in view of Burrows et al. (US 2004/0093371), hereinafter referred to as Burrows, in view of Andrews et al. (US 2003/0204569), hereinafter referred to as Andrews.

a. As per claim 6, MacIntosh discloses the invention substantially as claimed above. However, MacIntosh fails to explicitly teach image pattern recognition or utilizing a URI for a challenge interface.

Burrows teaches assigning a unique mail uniform resource identifier to the receiver and receiving a third electronic message at the mail uniform resource identifier (Para. 0232-0235). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of a URI for a challenge interface with e-mail spam filtering systems. One of ordinary skill in the art would have done so for the purpose of providing multiple available challenges including a "Turing Test" (Para. 0235). However, Burrows fails to explicitly teach image pattern recognition testing.

Andrews teaches delivering an e-mail message if a sender recognizes an image pattern (Para. 0022-0023). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary

Art Unit: 2141

skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of image recognition with spam filter challenges. One of ordinary skill in the art would have done so for the purpose of utilizing a challenge which includes non-text media which are known to be difficult for computers to recognize and automatically answer (Para. 0022).

b. As per claim 7, MacIntosh, Burrows, and Andrews teach the invention substantially as claimed above. However, MacIntosh fails to explicitly teach image pattern recognition or utilizing a URI for a challenge interface.

Burrows teaches presenting an online form to the sender including a challenge, wherein the delivering further comprises retrieving the private address associated with the mail uniform resource identifier and delivering the third electronic message to the receiver address with the private address as a sender address if the challenge response is approved (Para. 0232-0237). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of a URI for a challenge interface with e-mail spam filtering systems. One of ordinary skill in the art would have done so for the purpose of providing multiple available challenges including a "Turing Test" (Para. 0235). However, Burrows fails to explicitly teach image pattern recognition testing.

Andrews teaches delivering an e-mail message if a sender recognizes an image pattern (Para. 0022-0023). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of image recognition with spam filter challenges. One of ordinary skill in the art would have done

Art Unit: 2141

so for the purpose of utilizing a challenge which includes non-text media which are known to be difficult for computers to recognize and automatically answer (Para. 0022).

c. As per claim 8, MacIntosh, Burrows, and Andrews teach the invention substantially as claimed above. However, MacIntosh fails to explicitly teach utilizing a URI/URL for a challenge interface.

Burrows teaches wherein the uniform resource identifier comprises a uniform resource locator (Para. 0235). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of a URL for a challenge interface with e-mail spam filtering systems. One of ordinary skill in the art would have done so for the purpose of providing multiple available challenges including a "Turing Test" (Para. 0235).

d. As per claim 16, MacIntosh discloses a first code segment to assign a unique private address to a receiver (Col 12 line 16 though Col 13 line 13). However, MacIntosh fails to explicitly teach image pattern recognition or utilizing a URI for a challenge interface.

Burrows teaches assigning a unique mail uniform resource identifier to the receiver and receiving a third electronic message at the mail uniform resource identifier (Para. 0232-0235). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of a URI for a challenge interface with e-mail spam filtering systems. One of ordinary skill in the art would have done so for the purpose of providing multiple available challenges including a "Turing

Art Unit: 2141

Test" (Para. 0235). However, Burrows fails to explicitly teach image pattern recognition testing.

Andrews teaches delivering an e-mail message if a sender recognizes an image pattern (Para. 0022-0023). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of image recognition with spam filter challenges. One of ordinary skill in the art would have done so for the purpose of utilizing a challenge which includes non-text media which are known to be difficult for computers to recognize and automatically answer (Para. 0022).

e. As per claim 17, MacIntosh, Burrows, and Andrews teach the invention substantially as claimed above. However, MacIntosh fails to explicitly teach utilizing a URI/URL for a challenge interface.

Burrows teaches wherein the uniform resource identifier comprises a uniform resource locator (Para. 0235). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of a URL for a challenge interface with e-mail spam filtering systems. One of ordinary skill in the art would have done so for the purpose of providing multiple available challenges including a "Turing Test" (Para. 0235).

f. As per claim 20, MacIntosh and Burrows teach the invention substantially as claimed. However, MacIntosh fails to explicitly disclose image pattern recognition.

Andrews teaches delivering an e-mail message if a sender recognizes an image pattern (Para. 0022-0023). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of image

Art Unit: 2141

recognition with spam filter challenges. One of ordinary skill in the art would have done so for the purpose of utilizing a challenge which includes non-text media which are known to be difficult for computers to recognize and automatically answer (Para. 0022).

5. Claims 12-14, 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MacIntosh in view of Burrows.

a. As per claim 12, MacIntosh discloses the invention substantially as claimed above. However, MacIntosh fails to explicitly teach the use of a whitelist for approved senders.

Burrows teaches establishing a list of approved senders; wherein the delivering further comprises only delivering a message if a sender is one of the approved senders (Para. 0232, 0237). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of a whitelist with spam filtering systems. One of ordinary skill in the art would have done so for the purpose of allowing trusted senders to bypass challenges (Para. 0232).

b. As per claim 13, MacIntosh discloses including the private address in a list of approved senders (Col 13 line 50 through Col 13 line 7).

c. As per claim 14, MacIntosh discloses the invention substantially as claimed above. However, MacIntosh fails to explicitly teach the use of a whitelist for approved senders.

Burrows teaches wherein the list of approved senders comprises a whitelist (Para. 0232, 0237). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of a whitelist with spam filtering systems. One of ordinary skill in the art would have done so for the purpose of allowing trusted senders to bypass challenges (Para. 0232).

d. As per claim 18, MacIntosh discloses an email agent module configured to provide an email user with a private agent having a private agent email address and a public agent having a public agent email address; a mail transfer module that transfers an email message from the public agent to the private agent; and a mail delivery module that delivers the email message from the private agent to an address of the email user (Col 12 line 16 through Col 13 line 13). However, MacIntosh fails to explicitly teach the use of a whitelist for approved senders.

Burrows teaches establishing a list of approved senders; wherein the delivering further comprises only delivering a message if a sender is one of the approved senders (Para. 0232, 0237). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of a whitelist with spam filtering systems. One of ordinary skill in the art would have done so for the purpose of allowing trusted senders to bypass challenges (Para. 0232).

e. As per claim 19, MacIntosh discloses the invention substantially as claimed above. However, MacIntosh fails to explicitly teach the use of a whitelist for approved senders.

Art Unit: 2141

Burrows teaches wherein the list of approved senders comprises a whitelist (Para. 0232, 0237). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of a whitelist with spam filtering systems. One of ordinary skill in the art would have done so for the purpose of allowing trusted senders to bypass challenges (Para. 0232).

Conclusion

86. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Grant Ford whose telephone number is (571)272-8630. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-5:30 Mon-Thurs alternating Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharra can be reached on (571)272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2141

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

gmf



ANDREW CALDWELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER